

0800 Trial Opening

17 JAN 73

This trial is about slavery and self-government. It poses the questions:

Does the Pres have an unlimited right to lie to the American people?

If not, who is to limit him, and how is it to be done?

Purpose of this pro. is to make it even easier in future to fool the public about issues ^{use power monolithically from the WH.} than the way just done — and to ask if we're successful, this trial

should help at least some a little — restore (checks & balance) the Const. balance between Cong. & the Pres.

Can a republic form of govt — (with three separate branches & a free press) — survive the (practice of) slavery that the Executive ^{Branch} has practiced for the last generation? Has it survived?

At this moment, we have been ^{made} aware — by the events of the last 3 ^{2 mandates for power,} years (at the last for a specific, ^{attestations from witnesses,} month — 92,000 t. mostly in Hawaii & Saigon) (more than in London during the whole war) that we have an electoral monarchy. Is that what we want? Is that what we need? Is the US Const. obsolete in the 20th century?

~~The~~ No. ~~Admiral~~ ~~the~~ ~~its~~ ~~never~~ ~~has~~ ~~not~~
needed.

facts +
If ~~the~~ ^{fact} history in the PP had been available
to Cong over the past 20 years there would
have been no VN War, no American
Expeditionary force or bombing, and a
million lives would have been saved,
55,000 American.

And our democracy would not be in
the danger it's in.

[The pres. is focussing on press, though
indirectly — first pres. of a summer, to

At the time of the indictment, Adm. was
probably not thinking about Congress —
congressmen, felt that battle had been won.

(Yet Roy. relies on Oakes as much as
press & public — and Toy has been cast
in role of Senator or staff assistant: reporter);

The pres. is ^{attempting to use} ~~using~~ the ^{counts} ~~press~~ to legislate -
to change the laws & even the Const

This is the first attempt to make it criminal
^{in the courts}

to give ~~the~~ official information to Americans -
with no intent to hurt America. ^{They are asking the judges to} (The Espionage ^{act} ~~act~~
act was meant for espionage - giving military
secrets to foreign powers - not for informing one's
fellow Americans).

The Govt has asked for such a law - like
Britain's OSA.

p. 17 Did we ever take an oath on
serving?

(Did I, as Spec. Asst.?)

Signed a lie about "criminal penalties"?

I agreed to sign "termination statement"
as a condition of employment.

(What could be penalty on this?)

p. 18: I was authorized/ordered not to
delieve docs to TS CO.

Class. system is (a) An admin system

(b) which violates First Amendment

(binding on Pres, as on Congress;

not on private individuals or

(It is a conspiracy!) corps). (c) Not a lawful function

(I hope after trial: Am. people will
understand the separation of powers and the
First Amendment, and ^(act to restore) ~~thwart~~ protect
them.)

19. Doesn't this use give Exec power to legislate, & assign criminal sanction — in any area of "lawful function" not forbidden to it, if it can charge "conspiracy"?

Can Congress give Pres — in the name of "national defense" — broad power to suspend the Court, and its Amendments?
(esp., during "war"?)

See Rosenthal, Elected Anticuary (?)
Kernell, Garrison State

24. How rules for "controlling info" at most applied in its contractual relation with RAND, and could be charged against RAND; RAND doesn't have a conspiracy statute protecting its contractual rules.

38. How does ~~not~~ deal with continental defense, sabotage, etc.

Lappin : Boston Tea Party — dumped the
tea in the ocean.

We ...